A SPECIAL CLASS OF MIXED PRETERITES IN MIDDLE HIGH AND MODERN GERMAN

ACAD.
LUGD. BAT.
BIBL.

BY

O. P. RHYNE

A Dissertation Submitted to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Göttingen
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
1914

Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press

Vita.

I, Orestes Pearle, son of Peter S. and Julia A. Rhyne (formerly Rein) was born near Gastonia, N. C., on October 8, 1885. After receiving my primary education in the public schools, and my secondary education in Gaston College, Dallas, N. C., a preparatory school so named, I entered in the fall of 1903 the Sophomore class of Lenoir College, Hickory, N. C., from which institution, after one year's intermission in my studies, I was graduated in 1907 with the degree of A. B. In the fall of the same year I entered the University of North Carolina and received the degree of A. B. with the class of 1908. The following year I spent at the same university engaged in graduate work in English and German under Professors C. Alphonso Smith, J. F. Royster, and W. D. Toy, receiving the degree of A. M. in 1909. During the year 1909—10 I was the principal of the State High School at Stanley, N. C. The last three academic years have been spent at the Johns Hopkins University in the pursuit of graduate work in the following subjects: German Language and Literature, Germanic Philology, and English. I have taken courses under Professors Bright, Wood, Collitz, and Kurrelmeyer, and Dr. Roulston, to all of whom, and especially to Professors Collitz and Wood, I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude for their valuable aid and sympathetic encouragement which have been so freely bestowed.

The remaining chapters of this dissertation will be printed in "Hesperia, Schriften zur german. Philologie, hrsg. v. H. Collitz" Nr. 5.

Gedruckt bei Hubert & Co., G. m. b. H. in Göttingen.

Introduction.

That form of the German strong preterite 1. and 3. sing. ind. ending in -e (e. g. ſahe, wurde etc.) has been almost completely overlooked by grammarians. It is rare to find more than a single paragraph devoted to the subject by any one writer. No one at all has treated it at any considerable length. Some maintain that the form in question is due to this or that cause, some merely mention that such a thing exists, attempting no explanation, while others even fail to note its existence at all. This is the case notwithstanding the fact that the relative frequency of their occurrence in certain instances exceeds the correct forms without -e.

The form in question has been variously named; it is usually designated by the German scholars as "das paragogiſche -e". The object of the present investigation is to trace back to its origin the occurrence of the phenomenon and to indicate to some extent the geographical distribution of the forms throughout the various periods. An attempt will be made to show that its occurrence depends largely upon whether the document exists in manuscript or in a printed text, etc. Whenever the relative frequency of occurrence becomes very marked, enumerations will be given. Some statistics will be offered, showing the relation between strong and weak preterites in regard to final -e. Occasional reference will be made to subjunctive forms of the strong preterite. Throughout the whole, especially from the middle of the 15th century on, notice will often be taken of the radical vowels, and in some cases, of the radical consonants of the singular and plural of the strong preterite. These references are likewise chiefly incidental, the particular subject under discussion being the special

form of the strong preterite in -e. Some attention will be paid to the subject of apocope of final -e not only in verbs, but also in nouns and other parts of speech. Examples of the addition of a superfluous -e to words other than verbs will likewise occasionally be noted.

It is well at the outset to call attention to the difficulty of distinguising in the early texts the indicative and subjunctive forms. Often, or rather, as a rule, there is no consistency in the use of the umlaut sign; sometimes no subjunctive forms have the sign; in other cases some forms that from the construction ought to be indicative have the sign. The confusion of forms becomes exceedingly easy whenever the rule to drop most final e's in the subjunctive obtains, especially in view of the fact that at certain periods a great number of indicative forms take on a superfluous -e. This is especially the case in the South German dialects in the late 14th, 15th and 16th centuries. In these literary monuments, subjunctive strong preterites of the 1. and 3. sing. display the umlaut sign frequently, while omitting the final -e; at the same time, indicative forms may have the -e but no umlaut sign. In some rare instances the indicative may have both umlaut and final -e. This is especially confusing when the radical vowel is the same in the singular and plural, e. g. in the sixth class, or in cases where the radical vowel of the singular is not only identical with that of the plural but could not be mutated, as in case of reduplicating preterites. It will often be necessary to give the whole clause, or even sentence, in order to indicate the mood.

The subject could be treated in several ways — according to the chronological development, from a dialectical standpoint, or according to the various types of literature. Each of these methods has its objections. The occurrence of these e-forms of the indicative strong preterite is too general, at least for certain periods, to admit of a strictly dialectical treatment; furthermore, the texts cannot all be definitely located as to dialect. The various types of literature, although showing considerable well defined variations in the usage of these forms, cannot be so conveniently made the basis of a classification. Hence the subject matter will be presented strictly according

to chronological development. To be sure, the various dialects will always be considered; but they are not the basis of the classification. My selection of the various periods (each period being a century) is, it must be admitted, very arbitrary, but has been adopted because of its exceeding simplicity.

In presenting the material, the classification of verbs will be made, not according to the various classes of strong verbs, but with reference to the final consonant of the stem. This is the method followed by Kern[1]) and approved by K. v. Bahder[2]) in his review of Kern's article. In the case of compounds verbs, only the verbal component as a rule will be given. This is in opposition to the often expressed view that one cause for the existence of strong preterites 1. and 3. sing. ind. in -e is the tendency to avoid monosyllabic forms and to make them bisyllabic by the addition of -e, and hence that compound verbs would show a smaller percentage of these forms than the simple verbs. But an examination of forms throughout the whole period leads to the belief that there is nothing whatever in this claim. The very first case of a strong preterite in -e on record is a compound verb — irſtarbe[3]). In the absence of statistics to sustain the one or the other view, I have not been able to note any variation in usage that would invalidate the method of giving only the simple form of the verb.

---

[1]) Paul Kern, *Das starke Verb bei Grimmelshausen.* Journal of Germanic Philology vol. 2 p. 33ff.

[2]) Zs. f. d. Ph. 32, 106—111.

[3]) Hattemer, *St. Gallens altteutsche Sprachschätze.* Vol. 1, p. 326, 11th century.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41547013_0015

A. Examples, statistics, etc.

I. Exceptional instances. From earliest times up to 1300.

There are no examples of the strong preterite ind. in -e (1. and 3. sing.) in Old High German. No such forms are given in any of the Old High German grammars and the statement is made that the ind. prt. 1. and 3. sing. of strong verbs is without ending[1]). Although there are no e forms of the st. prt. ind. 1. and. 3. sing in Notker[2]), yet he has forms with analogical -e in the imper. sing. of strong verbs[3]).

The earliest example of a st. prt. ind. 3. sing. in -e that has been found, occurs in the eleventh century, Hattemer I, 327[4]). It is in a fragment of a creed. . . . das er geboren wart unt gefangen wart, unt daz er *irstarbe* . . . daz er zerehelle fuor . . . nam . . . irstuont . . . daz er andemo fierzechôsten tage after siner urstende ze himile *fuore* . . . etc.

These two examples, irstarbe and fuore, are clearly indicative but their final position in an object clause may have caused the writer to add an -e because of a sort of a confusion with the subjunctive. No other such forms occur in the whole of

---

[1]) cf. R. Westphal, *Philosophisch-Historische Grammatik d. deutsch. Sprache,* Jena 1869, p. 239; W. Braune, *Althochd. Gramm.,* 4. Aufl., Halle 1911; Alois Walde, *Die German. Auslautsgesetze,* Halle 1900, p. 110 etc.

[2]) At least no mention of their occurrence is made by J. Kelle in his *Untersuchung zur Überlieferung etc. der Psalmen Notkers,* Berlin 1889.

[3]) cf. Graff, IV, 764 hae imper. for hah; etc.

[4]) Hattemer, *St. Gallens altteutsche Sprachschätze,* Hs. 1394, XI. Jh. The first of these two examples is cited by Weinhold, *Alem. Gramm.,* § 345. An earlier example of a st. prt. ind. in -a occurs in Old Saxon. Heliand 2017.

. . . . . Tho ni was lang te thiu
that it san *antfunda* frio sconiosta,
Cristes moder.

vol. I. of Hattemer. The dialect is Alemannic and the period that of the transition from Old High to Middle High German.

Genesis und Exodus[1]).

In the rimed version of *Genesis and Exodus* several examples of the st. prt. ind. sing. in -e are found, all of them in the 3rd. person. The following enumeration contains all the examples in the *Genesis* together with some from the *Exodus*.

daz ophir was süzze,
unser herre im *gehiezze*
daz . . . Gen. 29, 11.
Do der bote ze huse chom
do *warde er* wol enphangen . . . Gen. 42, 33.
Swelhe er niht schinte
die *truge er* in der hente . . . Gen. 59, 35.
Laban sûchot unde *vande*
niht sin apgot . . . Gen. 62, 10.
Wie in sîn brûdir *enphienge*
so er heim *chome* . . . Gen. 63, 15.
Er tet siben venie
ê daz er im *chome* enkegene . . . 66, 8
dar umbe *warde er* unde sin vater
erslogen an der stunde . . . 68, 2. 3.
da *parge er* untir
daz heidenische wndir . . . 70, 4.
sie *truge im* die gebaere
die im waren unmaere . . . 78, 10.
daz er Joseph wart genaedich:
des *warde er* vil saelich . . . 80, 5.
sin chlage *ware* ungefuge . . . 98, 14.
von himel got jacobe erschein
da er nachtes *lage ein* . . . 101, 12.
da sîn vater unde sîn ane *lage* 105, 14.

Thus we have in the Genesis warde 3, vande once, truge 2, parge once, lage 2, enphienge once, chome 2, ware once, gehiezze once, a total of 14. 9 of the 14 examples occur immediately before a word beginning with a vowel. It seems that the following vowel is largely responsible for the -e. Perhaps the medial position of the final consonant of the verb between

[1]) *Genesis und Exodus*, nach der Milstäter (Kärnthen) Hs. hrsg. von J. Diemer, Wien 1862. The date is early in the 12th century. The same poem is found in Hoffmanns *Fundgruben*, vol. I, but according to the Vienna Ms. No e-forms of the st. pt. were found in it.

vowels makes the consonant voiced and the -e is the sign of it. The -e may not have been pronounced. In nearly every case the -e is after a voiced consonant. In the rime and also in final position in the clause it was almost surely pronounced. Usually, when a consonant follows, these same preterites end in an unvoiced consonant, wart 116, 7, lac, etc. As a rule, however, when a vowel follows, such preterites have no final -e but the consonant is voiced, e. g. 100, 28; 114, 29, 30 etc. In the case of the weak pret. it is exactly the reverse. When a vowel follows, the final -e is dropped almost without exception and always retained in other cases. There is practically no apocope of final -e in the Geneſis and the Exodus. The following examples occur in the Exodus:

Do Moyſes zů im chom do *warde*
er wol enphangen 124, 21
. . . . . ir tatet unrehte
daz diſiu rede ie *warde erhaben* . . . 134, 10.
Daz *warde im* vil unwert . . . . . 134, 18.

mage (= mag) 134, 27. ſach occurs exclusively. The 2. p. prt. ind. strong always ends in -e. In every case of the 3. p. forms in -e the radical vowel of the singular is kept. In some cases about this time the radical vowel of the plural is often found in the singular.

The following examples occur in "*Vom Leben und Leiden Jesu, vom Antichrist und vom jüngsten Gericht*" [1]):

Do der unguete
ez allez ſamt *erfüre*
do hiez er ſi dannen gen . . . 145, 29.
Do *gienge* er ůf einen berch hohen . . . 154, 37.
Darinne *bestuende* dehain lîp
wan Chriſt unde daz wîp . . . . 167, 5.
Geteilt was der ir ſin
idoch *gestuende* ſi bi in . . . . . 161, 32.
Ein *warfe* den Menſchen . . . . 193, 35.

gabe: lage 183, 17, 18; ſach: nach 164, 20 but ich ſah: geſchah 173, 4, 7. Original uo is usually ue, sometimes u as ſtuend (ind.) 173, 13 etc.; trueg and trug 175, 7, 9; hueb 175, 37 etc. The e-forms occur before vowels and consonants indifferently. funde

[1]) In Hoffmanns *Fundgruben* für Geschichte der deut. Spr. Breslau 1830 Vol. I. Ms. from end of 13th, the poem from the 12th century.

occurs for funden 145, 45, just as in the Genesis lage (above p. 2) is either singular or plural.

Speculum Ecclesiae[1]).

The following examples are taken from this collection of sermons: Den gwalt den er ſcon. Petro gab. den *verlehe* er öch anderen ſinen holdin. p. 7; in deiſelbin laſtir viel alliz manchunne. ê daz der heilige Chriſt in dieſe werlt *chome* p. 9; den nam̄ gab im der heilige engil. ê daz ſin můtir ſîn ſwanger *wrde.* p. 17; der *hiezze* Nabuzardan (sic) wider zu ierlm̄. p. 45; *ware* (ind.) p. 48; tâte 63 but tet 64; s. Petrus. do er gotis driſtunde verlögent. daz enzêlt deheim bůch waz er *sprache.* wan daz eîne. daz er bitterlichen wainti . . . p. 50; Ê aber von ſinen iungirn *schiede,* ſo getroſte er ſi p. 79; Zedem andeme mâle. *warde er* in . . . . . geſant p. 85; . . ê ûf der erdi gegebin *wurde.* . . . . p. 85; Er *vermeide* den win . . . 91 etc.

Here again we see that most of the forms with -e are in final position in subordinate clauses. This is very probably due to a sort of confusion with subj. forms that occur so frequently in this position. No difference whatever is made if a vowel follows the word in medial position. The percentage of all st. pts. that have an extra -e is very insignificant.

Altdeutsche Predigten und Gebete[2]).

Ê got geſchuophe himel alde herde, do was er . . 9, 2; Dar *gienge er* nah ir bet. 22, 16; wie *vande er* ez do? *vande er* iz laere? Nein, er fand dar inne zwo ſweſter . . . . 25, 19; . . . . . do er die vrone botſchaft hin ze ir *warfe,* wie fand er ſie? . . . 25, 26;

---

[1]) *Speculum Ecclesiae* (altdeutsch). Hrsg. von J. Kelle, München 1858. Benedictbeurer Predigtsammlung. 12th century. The dialect is Bavarian.

[2]) Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Wackernagel, Basel 1876. Weinhold has an article p. 446-517, "Die Sprache in den Altdeutschen Predigten und Gebeten." In discussing the dialect he says (p. 449). "Eher kann af 26,18, das neben ab 26, 16 entschlüpft, und warfe (= warb) 25, 26 als bairisches Zeugnis gelten." He very likely means only the use of f for b. The -e in the st. prt. ind. 1. 3. sing. is no indication of the Bavarian dialect as opposed to the Alemannic or any other High German dialect. This is true at least for the 12th and 13th centuries. Later it becomes more characteristic of the Alem. and the Swabian. The date of Wackernagel's *Predigten* is the 12th and 13th centuries.

Die ſelikeit die er uns zuo *truoge,* **diu was unſer.** 65, 25; . . . . **unt des bluotes iheſu Chriſti das von ſinem toten lîp unt hercen** *flosse,* **indem er uns zuo dem anderen male hat wider geboren** . . . . . 67, 15.

Here again we see that often when a vowel follows, the preterite has a final -e, while the same verb often omits the -e when the next word begins with a consonant. Here too it seems that strong preterites in -e occupy as a rule the final position in the clause.

Examples of ind. st. prt. in -e occur very rarely in Schönbach's *Altdeutsche Predigten*[1]). I give below a few examples. In all the clauses beginning with **êe**, the verb is very likely in the subjunctive. There is, however, no such rule in the M. H. G. grammars. Weinhold cites a preterite as indicative in just such a sentence, which shows that he construed such verbs as indicative[2]). Examples: **er** (Peter) **was ein gůt mane geweſen unde gereht êe er bekart** *wůrde* **zů dem hohen lebene** 64, 7; **ee daz ſie** (Maria) *vůre in* **die himeliſche Stat, joch êe dan ſi wůrde geborn** 70, 13; **Alſo ginch er in vor bis er** *quame ober* **daz hûs** 90, 34; **Do Herodes daz** *vorname* 90/40; *irhube* (ind?) 98, 24; **lach unde** *beite* **des dodes** 104, 29.

No examples could be found in the text or the critical readings of Lachmanns edition of Iwein. In two of the Mss. of the Gregorius[3]) several st. prts. in -e occur: 2884 **ſlieffe** G (last half of the 14th C.), all others **ſlief**; 2910 **truge** G alone; 3126 **beſloſſe** E (15th C. Bavarian dialect); 3182 **liezze** G alone; 3535 **vergaſe** E alone; 3542 **wurde** G, others **ward**.

In "*Altdeutsche Predigt von Kristi Geburt*"[4]) the following examples were found: **do unſer frowe joſeph enpheſtenet** *wâre.* **do** *wâre* **ſie ſwanger** (p. 259); **niwan daz er** *phlage* **ſwa ſi** *wâre* **unde ſwellende ſie** *vûre.* **un̄ ſo ouch unſer herre geboren** *warde* **alſo ich iu nu ſagen wil** (p. 260). **ware** and **vure** are very likely subj. **er** *ware* (ind.) **ſo geweltlich** p. 260. Other examples: *swure, gebute*

---

[1]) Graz, 1886. Only vol. 1. was examined.

[2]) *Alem. Gr.* § 345 p. 342. **geſchuofe**, Wack. *Pr.* 9, 2. See above P. 4.

[3]) Pauls edition was used.

[4]) Alemannia 9, 255ff. The editor, A. Birlinger, says in regard to the date: "Diese . . . . . Predigt gehört der Grenzscheide des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts an; sie steht in einem Perg. Codex des XIII. sec., ... ist aus einer dem XII. sec. angehörigen Vorlage abgeschrieben." p. 260.

(= gebote), *gabe*, all p. 260. Such forms occur as wart, hiez, was, genas, chom, erschain, etc. Old ei is written ai. The dialect is Alemannic.

Albrecht von Halberstadt[1]).

The following instances were found:

ieslich ûbte sîne kraft,
swer da *wurde* sigehaft
dem wart ein Kranz espîn . . . . 26, 821—23.

Nu si Jupiter sus *schufe*
daz sie mit ir hufe
ir namen *schribe* im sande . . . . 38, 79—81.

schribe and schufe are both indicative.

murmelende er eteswaz sprach
als er es ir *erbunde* 55, 180, 1.

daz der boum von dem laste
ich wene zu der erde *sige* . . . 61, 52, 3.

die maget hiez Echo
der *verbunde* Juno
daz si niht sprechen kunde . . . . . 71, 30—32.

Sie was ein maget ltphaft (Echo)
ê sie *wurde* sus verschaft . . . 71, 36, 37.

ich quam listecliche dar,
ê sie mîn wurden gewar,
dem hûse alsô nahe,
unz ich die swester *sâhe* . . . . . 87, 85—88.

This is the first example of sahe found. All second persons ind. prt. of strong verbs end in -e, e. g. du swure 114,261; sluge du 115, 273, etc.

Thus we see that the e-forms of the 1. 3. sing. of st. prt. ind. are not confined at this time to the South German dialects. We have here several examples of the radical vowel of the plural carried over into the singular, e. g. schribe, erbunde, sige, verbunde, wurde, sahe. All the e-forms found in Albrecht von Halberstadt (and only the e-forms) have the radical vowel identical with that of the plural. Thus levelling begins at this time, being first evident in the forms of the singular in -e.

---

[1]) Albrecht von Halberstadt. Translations from Ovid's Metam. 1210. Published by Karl Bartsch 1861. Quedlinburg und Leipzig. A. von H. was a Saxon but according to Bartsch (Einleitung CXXVIII) his dialect is Thuringian.

Konrad Fleck, *Flore und Blancheflur*[1]).

Unde hiels in da zuo, 803, is given in the text but H has hielse—preterite of halsen. Er wart mir so ze teile 5256; both B and H have wurt. Si vieng in unde zuhte in dan 7185; vinge . . . . . zuhch in H. These are the only examples in the whole poem. liesz 5300 H is subj.

Der Nibelunge Not[2]).

Of all the Mss. of *Der Nibelunge Not* only C has any considerable number of e-forms of the st. prt. Below are given all the examples that occur in the first 1000 quatrains of *Der Nibelunge Not.*

Wie Sifrit ze Wormse kome C. kame d (beginning of the 16th C); 100, 3 ware d, others have wart; 203, 3 sahe C, others sach, sah; 207, 2 truge C, others truoc; 211,2 des lage ir C, others lag, lac; 381, 2 wurde (ind.) A(Alemannic 1280); 486, 1 Do chome er fur C, others kam, kom; 551, 1 luode h I(I 14th C); 526, 4 chome diu Vrowe only C; 527, 1 chome only C; 637, 2 truge C, others truog; hienge C only; 649, 4 truge C, others truoc; 650, 1 Da *hienge ich* C only; 659, stunde im C alone; 672, 3 si *truge in* mit gewalte C alone; 683,4 da er *warde* wol enpfangen C alone; 767, 2 chome C; 846, 1 chome C alone; 948, 1 ware d, others have wart; 951, 3 Im *hienge eine* ziere wâsen C alone.

There are thus in the first 4000 lines of C 16 cases of the st. prt. 1. 3. sing. ind. ending in -e; A has one, d 2, h and I one each. Here for the first time we see the superfluous -e in the 1. person, e. g. 650, 1 . . Da hienge ich. Of course the 2. sing. ind. st. prt. still ends in -e. Occasionally words other than preterites add an extra -e but very rarely in C, e. g. heime 222, 2; gewalte 672, 3; hofe: biscofe (both nomi-

[1]) Published by Emil Sommer 1846. The date is about 1212. Sommer gives the text of the Heidelberg Ms. H., 15th century. B is the Berlin Ms., also of the 15th century. Konrad Fleck was an Alsatian or a Swabian. Ms. B is written in the Alsatian dialect.

[2]) I used Bartsch's edition. Ms. C is from the beginning of the 13th C. cf. *Germ.* X, 505-7. Otherwise *Germ.* IX, 381. If the number of e-forms is any indication, the Ms. is very much later than the early part of the 13th century.

native) 658, 12. As a rule, however, only strong preterites 1. 3. sing. add a superfluous -e [1]).

There are no e-forms of the st. prt. in the *Marienleben* of Bruder Philipp der Cartäuser [2]).

In Lutwin's *Adam und Eva* [3]) several instances occur, All that occur in the first 2025 lines are given: Ich **gewanne** nie so gute ru 340; Do **kame ein** ungewitter noch (nach); Er **rüffe** lute 543; mir **riete** der (sic) Schlange 558; **gewanne**: wanne (= denn) 1593; **erſchracḱete**: wackete 1965; **wurt** is the usual subj. form, e. g. 452 etc. The 2. sing. st. prt. ind. may have no -e and no -ſt ending, e. g., du **kam** 492 — thus being identical with the 1. 3. sing. There is some levelling, a fact which favors a late date (e. g. **verbargen** 534).

There is no example of a st. prt. ind. 1. 3. sing. in -e in Gotfried Hagen's rimed chronicle [4]), nor in the *Martina* of Hugo von Langenstein [5]), 1293. In both cases there is no levelling of radical vowels of sing. and plural. There is no apocope of final -e in the former and very little in the latter. This is about the time for the beginning of apocope of final -e in all words in the South German dialects. This was never practiced to any great extent outside of these dialects and almost none in the northern regions of Germany [6]).

Several examples of st. prts. in -e occur in the Regula

---

[1]) Weinhold, *Alem. Gr.* § 345 cites two examples further on in C, hienge Nib. C. 5, 538 and ſahe 16, 529. These are both for the first person. Other examples for the third person are truge Nib. C. 1665, lage 1697, warde 2058, ſahe 2432 etc, all given above.

[2]) In Kürschner D. N. L. 10. B. (Edited by F. Bobertag) pp. 1—92. All the 3095 lines were read. The date is early in the 13th century. The dialect is Bavarian.

[3]) Hrsg. v. Wilhelm Meyer, Tübingen, 1881. BLV 153. Bd. According to Goedeke, Gr. 1. 130 the author is an Austrian and the date the 13th century. According the Meyer it is the 14th or the 15th century. See Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akad. Phil.-Hist. Classe, 4. Dez. 1880.

[4]) Gotfrid Hagen, "*Dit is dat boich van der stede Colne.*" 1270. Ch. D. S. 12. B. This is the oldest chronicle of Cologne.

[5]) Hrsg. v. A. v. Keller. BLV. 38. B. The dialect is Swabian.

[6]) "Entschieden mitteldeutsch ist die Beibehaltung der unbetonten Endvocale." O. Behaghel, *Geschichte d. d. Sprache*[3] p. 67. "Mitteldeutsch" is used here in contradistinction to "Süddeutsch".

Selphardi[1]): so beſahe man wol waz da behalten were 993,27; unde beginnet zesagene von siner herschaft wie rich er ware 993, 5: this is very probably subj. although the subj. here is in every other case were.

unde ſahe viel gerne daz 993, 30; durch den er dannen gienge (ind.) 994, 23, etc.

Only one example of a st. prt. in -e occurs in the first 620 lines of the *Demantin* of Berthold von Holle:

Mit wê gedanen gedinge
he daz an *gevinge* . . . 121, 2.

This is out of a total of 164 strong preterites that occur in this section of the poem. Among the forms are the following: reit, bot, zoch, quam, nam, ran, gaf, gap, geſchach, ſach etc. wer is the regular subj. form. All other st. prt. subjs. have the -e. There are no extra final e's except the one given. All weak preterites 1. 3. sing. end in -e. There is practically no apocope of final -e in any kind of words[2]).

In Stricker's Klage über den Verfall der Dichtkunſt in Öſterreich[3]) one example was found: Swie vil er gaz, so iahe er doch, Er hete grozen hungen noch, line 3. There is no levelling. We find such forms as reit 61, treip 91, ſprach, worf but warf 86, 22 etc.

Weinhold in his Alem. Gr. § 345 gives several instances of st. prts. 1. 3. sing. ind. in -e. According to him, examples for the first person are something like two centuries later in occurring than those for the third person. This is the case for Alemannic. In Bavarian there is a difference of less than one century. This is due mainly to the fact that examples are found about a century earlier in Alemannic than in Bavarian. The greater relative frequency of occurrence of the 3rd person of the e-forms is due, in my opinion, to the relatively greater number of all 3rd person forms as compared with those of the 1st person. The fact remains, however,

[1]) A selection from this is printed in Wackernagel's *Altd. Lesebuch* col. 993 ff. 13th century.

[2]) The *Demantin* was published by Karl Bartsch. BLV. 123. Bd. The date is the end of the 13th century. Berthold was from near Hildesheim, but his dialect is mitteldeutsch.

[3]) Published in v. d. Hagen's *Germania,* II, 82. From the Heidelberg Ms., ca. 1300.

that there is something like a difference of a century between the time of the first appearance of 3rd and 1st p. forms of the strong preterite in -e. Most of the examples cited by Weinhold in his *Alem. Gr.* have either been given or will be given later. He cites many more forms in -e in his Bair. Gr. than in his *Alem. Gr.* He says nothing, however, about the relative frequency of occurrence of such forms in the Alem. and the Bavarian dialects. Practically all of his examples in either case are from the 12th and 13th centuries. With reference to the endings he says: Selten tritt dieses -e zu -i über; ich kenne aus unseren Quellen nur fēngi, giengi. Osw. 934 (*St. Oswalds Leben*, Hrsg. von L. Ettmüller, Zürich, 1835, nach Schaffhauser Hs. von 1472). I have not found any such forms. In his *Bair. Gr.* § 290 a large number of st. prts. in -e is cited, which I shall not repeat here.

Since several examples of e-forms of the st. prt. occur in Ms. M of Gotfrid's *Tristan*, all the examples found in any of the *Tristan* Mss. irrespective of date will be give at this point [1]).

422 wuhſe MB, all others have wuohs; 1424, geſwande MW; 1441, hielſ M, halſte B (weak); 2573, truoge M, all others trug; 2823, mage M alone; 2934, hewe he N, hiege er R, hewe er S; 9166, hiewe RS; 9327, lage MBE; 10342 war for wart (early for war); 13978 geſahe M, geſach BbE, geſähe others (subj.); 15312, war F for wart; 18434, lage: tage FW, others lac: tac.

In a collection of the rubrics occurring throughout E, given by Marold (Einl. XLVI) there are 55 st. prts. 1. 3. ind. and not one ending in -e. We find such forms as traib, graif, was, lies (ließ), etc. The subj. has -e. In the same list there are 15 weak preterites without final -e and not one retains it. Thus the rule here is for all ind. prts. st. or weak not to have final -e, while the subjs. of both classes of verbs usually retain it. These rubrics are all in prose. With S it

---

[1]) The critical edition of Karl Marold, Leipzig 1906 was used. All the variant readings were examined closely. Mss. referred to: M, 13th century Alem.; H, 13th century, Alem.; F, 1343, Alem.; W, middle of 14th century, Alem. B, 1323, middle-Franconian; N 14th century; E, R, and S are all Alemannic Mss of the 15th century.

is somewhat different[1]). In the whole collection of all the prose rubrics in this Ms. there are 64 examples 1. 3. sing. st. prt. without -e and 4 with -e. In the same there are 22 weak preterites with final -e and 22 without -e. These are the 4 examples of the e-forms: 7040 Wie Triſtan und Morolt mit einander kempften und wie Triſtan Morolt ſinen Helm *abschluge*, und in verwundet. 8933 Wie Triſtan mit dem Trachen ſtreit und er in zu tode *schluge* und er ime die zunge uß ſneyt und die in ſinen Buſen tet. 9496 . . . . das es nieman *sahe* (ind.). 14346 Wie der kunig Marcke zu Walte fur mit ſinen Jegern und Triſtan doheim *bleibe* und ſich ſiech machet. Such forms occur as wart, was, hies, ſtreit, ſneyt, bleibe, wurt (ind.) 12, 160, bott zoch etc, There is no levelling except in wurt. From the figures above we see that nearly 7 % of all st. prts. (all 3rd sing.) ind. in the prose rubrics have final -e. The same Ms. has only two cases of such forms in all 19, 552 lines. Of course a scribe would take more liberties with the prose rubrics than he would with the text, but after all there remains in this case a considerable margin of difference between prose and verse. We shall see more about this later. In the rubrics of the Ms 50 % of all weak preterites omit -e.

Parzifal . . . Ms D.

It is very seldom that one finds an example of a st. prt. ind. in -e in the critical readings of *Parzifal*. All that were found I give below. Lachmann's edition was used. 41, 27 In dwunge sich Ggg, others Da twanc in; 101, 16 E er *schiede* von der frowen (in text), ſchied D, ſchiet gg; 119, 13 ſie *hiesse* d, others hiez; 208, 17 Er lage an G, others lag, lac; 460, 10 chome G, others kom; 485, 27 hienge ers G, others hienc; 517, 22 im *stunde ouch* ietweder zan Als einem eber wilde, D alone; 541, 3 chome G, others kom.

[1]) Marold, Einl. XLIX S, Hamburger Stadtbibliothek; Abschrift eines älteren Codex (1722). Das Original befand sich im Besitz von Schertz in Straßburg und war nach einer mitkopierten Notiz am Schlusse von Hans Brant 1489 geschrieben worden.

II. More common occurrence. From 1300 to 1400.

Heinrich von Meissen (Frauenlob)[1]) does not use the e-forms of the st. prt. at all. In the preface to Frauenlob's poems, Ettmüller gives some anonymous verses which he would ascribe to him In these few short poems such forms occur several times:

und hette dar
sin volk und sih
über den fort mit listen
Jacob gebracht, da *blibe er* ganz allein XIII.
do er *sahe* das — XIV "Laiton 14"
Und als solche wort Rebecca *vername*
sprach sie zu Jacob irm son lobesame . . . XVI.

war XIV, Blüender ton 13, XV Guldin ton 8, and was XIV Radweis 9 etc. both occur. The usual form is sach. The 2. p. sing. st. prt. ind. still ends in -e, e. g. du waere, du liesse, etc. No examples of the st. prt. ind. 1st and 3rd sing. in -e occur in those poems of Frauenlob about the authorship of which there is no question. The whole of Ettmüller was examined pretty carefully. The examples given are all from the poems in the preface. If these poems are Frauenlob's they are from a Ms. much later than his other poems.

I could find no example of the form under discussion in Burkhart von Fricke's *Habsburg-Österreichisches Urbarbuch*[2]). All weak preterites retain -e. There is very little apocope of final -e in any sort of words.

One verb in Matthias v. Beheim's *Evangelienbuch*[3]) has regularly the -e in the preterite, -hiuwe. No other strong verb has -e in the sing. ind. prt. I read only the book of Mark. In

---

[1]) Hrsg. von Ludw. Ettmüller, Quedlinburg 1843. H. v. Meissen (1253?—1318) was a Thuringian by birth. He won the name "Frauenlob" by his extravagant praise of women.

[2]) Hrsg. von F. Pfeiffer, Stuttgart 1850. BLV. 19. Bd. Early 14 century. The dialect is Bavarian.

[3]) Published by R. Bechstein, Leipzig 1867. Beheim lived in Halle and his dialect is Middle-German — "das mittelste Mitteldeutsch". His translation of the Gospels was made in 1343. "Die 3. P. praet. des st. Verbums hat vereinzelt ein -e nach Analogie der schw. Conj. in hiuwe (von houwen) statt hiu. Nur einmal hiuw J. 18, 10." Einl. LXXVII.

this, one instance of hiuwe occurs, —hiuwe ime (das Or ab) 14, 47. There is practically no apocope of -e. All weak prts. retain the -e, as well as the st. prt. subj. sing. There is no levelling between the sing. vowel and that of the plural, but the vowel of the p. part. is often taken over into pt. pl., e. g. worden Mark 1, 5; worfin 12, 8 are the usual forms. Such sing. forms occur as ſteic 1, 19, ſach 1, 10, bleip, 1, 10, treip, zureiz 1, 26, greif, zôch etc. Two st. verbs are usually inflected weak: rûfte 1, 20; 3, 23 etc. and ſcrîete (= schrie) 1, 23; 9, 24, etc. worfe and worde are subj. forms.

No e-forms could be found in *Elsässische Predigten*[1]), nor could any levelling be detected. There is almost no apocope of final -e.

In Friedrich Closener's *Straßburgische Chronik*[2]) the e-forms of the st. prt. occur comparatively often. All that occur in the whole chronicle are given below.

verlore 24	2	ſchluge 35	2
fure 25	3	lage 45	3
kame 64	1	geſchahe 14	2
name 124	1	weiche 53	1
erwarbe 6	1	ſtreiche 53	1
hube 7	6	ſprache 93	1
ſtarbe 15	3	lude 85	1
bleibe 35	2	bote 2	5
begrube 119. . . .	1	riete 94	1
ſchuffe 52	2	hielte 107	1
riefe 87	1	bate 116	1
vienge 9	10	beſaſſe 15	1
gienge 23	7	aſſe 47	1

total 61

Almost half of the examples are found with guttural stems. If the phenomenon were due exclusively to a confusion of strong and weak preterites as most grammarians

[1]) Published in Alemannia I, 60—78, 186—194, 225—250, II, 1—28, 101—119, 197—223. These are a translation from the Latin, — *Sermones in evangelia et epist.* (1362).

[2]) BLV. Vol. 1 pp. 1—127. This chronicle was finished in 1362. The author, F. Closener, a priest, translated the old Latin chronicle of Gottfried von Ensmingen (of a century before), adding much of his own material. The dialect is Alem. The whole chronicle was read. No account was taken of the number of the regular forms of the st. prt. occurring.

assume, one would expect the dental stems, especially the t-stems, to be far in the lead in number of verbs as well as in actual occurrences of e-forms.

There is no levelling at all. We find reit—ritten, bleib—bliben, ſtarb—ſturben, was=waren, etc. throughout. ziehen never occurs, zogen always being the inf. form. zoch occurs several times but the usual pt. is zogte which occurs dozens of times, e. g. p. 23. There are thousands of st. prts. in the whole chronicle. Less than 3% of all st. prts. have =e.

Only two examples of e-forms of the st. prt. could be found in the Chronicle of Jacob Twinger von Königshofen[1]). These are: ſtieße 235, 20 and der ginge ime 236. 4. The 2. p. sing. ind. of the st. prt. ends in =e, e. g. du riete 238, 1, etc. zogete 251, 23; 264, 6 etc. and růfte 270, 13 etc. are exclusive forms. There is no levelling in any class. The =e of the weak prt. is always retained even if the next word begins with a vowel, as ſolte ustragen 255, 14; getroumde ime 256, 10; wolte er 257, 6, etc. The pt. subj. always retains =e.

Two examples of the st. prt. in =e were found in Dalimil's *Chronik von Böhmen*[2]): ware (ind.) 3, 25 and virtruge 24, 35. There is some levelling but only in class III. e. g. ſtarben 17, 13; wordin 42, 30; in class I. we find bleib 29, 36; erſchain 37, 7; ſchreib (pt.) 18, 1; ſchreib (pres.) 18, 6; in class II. flugin 34, 6; virlurin 36, 1 etc. There are hundreds of examples of st. prts. but only 2 with =e. Practically all weak pts. drop final =e. Almost all e's in final position are dropped.

No e-forms occur in Jörg Katzmair's *Denkschrift über die Unruhen zu München in den Jahren 1397—1403*[3]). There are some examples of levelling in class I., e. g. rit 468, 25; rait 468, 32 etc. Such ind. forms occur as ward(t), waz, hueb, fand pat, ſtarb, etc. Old uo is usually ue. All weak prts. omit =e, e. g. ſandt 472, 3; mueſt man 465, 15; fuert 468, 26 etc. All st. prts. subj. also omit final =e, as wär, erfund 469, 15, wurd 480, 33 etc.

---

[1]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 8. The date of composition was ca. 1400, the author, a priest.

[2]) Published by Venceslav Hanka, BLV. 4°. Bd. The Ms. is dated 1389. Only the first 53 pages were read.

[3]) Ch. D. S, Vol. 15. The dialect is Bavarian.

In the *Gesta Romanorum*[1]) there are no st. prts. ind. or subj. that end in -e. All weak prts. too omit final -e. There is no levelling of radical vowelſ. Thus reit — ritten p. 41, ſchrayn; ward(t) — wurden 41, fand — funden 47; zoch — zugen, etc. rûft (prt.) (46) is the usual form.

No examples of the form under discussion were discoverable in Ulman Stromer[2]). Almost all prt. subjs. of st. verbs omit -e, as well as all weak preterites. According to Kern in his discussion of the language of Stromer p. 308, there is no levelling. He overlooked the forms ſtarben 85, 17 and ſchid 26, 19. The vowelſ of the ſing. and the plural are usually kept distinct. Such forms occur as belaib 31, 12, rait 35, 21, ſtarb; bard and barff almoſt always for ward and warff, fing 39, 17, fil 39, 17, ſlieff 69, 1, ſliff 65, 11, lies 42, 5, ließ 27, 4, loff (= lief) 76, 26, geſach (for geſchach always).

No caſe of the e-form of the st. prt. was found in *Die Weverslaicht*[3]). Several were found in "*Dat nuwe boich*"[4]). In den irſten *geviele id* zo einen ziden 272, 16; ginge 273; do ließe he 304, 36; do *ließe* in der rait uß gevenkniſſe 280, 8; do *beboide* der rait — — 288, 6, so also 298, 6. These are all the examples that were found. They represent a very small percentage of all st. prts. Practically all weak preterites and st. subj. preterites retain final -e. Thus it would appear that the addition of an extra -e to st. prts. is independent of apocope. At least we cannot say that it is due directly to this, as some explain it.

---

[1]) "*Gesta Romanorum*, das ist der Römer Tat". Hrsg. von A. v. Keller. Quedlinburg und Leipzig 1841. The date of the translation is about the end of the 14th century. The dialect is Bavarian.

[2]) "*Püchel von mim geschlecht und abentewr*". 1349—1407. Ch. D. S. Vol. 1, Nürnberg. Edited by Theodor Kern, Leipzig, 1862. The chronicle was begun about 1360 and was continued up till Stromer's death in 1407.

[3]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 12, Köln. This is in verse. The date is the latter part of the 14th century.

[4]) Also in vol. 12, Ch. D. S. This is in prose. Author unknown. The date is the very end of the 14th century.

Folk-song[1]).

In No. 4 of Liliencron's *Volkslieder* (author a Swiss) there are no e-forms of the st. prt., save zogete 50. There is no apocope. In No. 13, Schlacht bei Lampen (Alem. 1339) there is one example: Der fenrich witer *sprache*: grafe § 11. There is much apocope, but no levelling. In No. 30 we find one instance: Drum *schwure ich* nicht gern vor dich 176. The vowel of the p. part. is often taken into both the sing. and also the plural. e. g. hob 174, schwor 333, zogen 289 etc. This song is Thuringian, ca. 1385. In No. 34, Die Schlacht bei Sempach (Alem. ca. 1386) we find one instance, kame[2]). There are two versions of this poem, one of which is according to Tschudi; in stanza 26 (Tschudi) we find grif, other version greiff. Stanza 49 dare: ware (= wahr). No. 40 (1397—1400 Alem. scribe): es was im hornunge, drumb es in ubel *gelunge* p. 193, 2095. No. 51 Johannes Engelmair's *red vom concili zu Constanz.* (Kärnthen-Bavarian) 1414—1418: von dem concili wil ich schreiben . . . wie es zum ersten *vienge* an 67—69 p. 259; landen: *fande* p. 259. No. 115, p. 535 (Bavarian, much later form than the date would indicate) 1462: ziele: *entfiele* stanza 15; man *zoge aus* und st. 29; rit (for reit) in st. 4.

Thus we see that a minimum of use was made of the e-forms of the st. prt. ind. in the Folk-song. This may be partly due to the fact that such forms were never popular but belonged to the higher classes[3]), or to the fact that only a very sparing use of them was ever made in verse.

The following examples occur in Die Zerstörung der Burg

---

[1]) Vol. 1 of Liliencron, *Volkslieder*, was examined pretty carefully and the very few instances discovered are here given. The songs are referred to by their number in Liliencron's collection.

[2]) Also given in Wack. *Altd. Lesebuch.* col. 1295.

[3]) See Rückert, *Schlesische Mundart im Mittelalter* p. 218: In unserer Mundart erscheinen solche (e-forms of the ind. st. prt.) Formen sehr frühe, aber sehr vereinzelt, und es scheint, als wenn sie auch hier nie ein wirkliches Leben im Volke geführt hätten, sondern mehr ein Product der Reflexion, nur nicht gerade der gelehrten zünftigen Grammatiker geblieben sind. . . . W. (Weinhold) bemerkt mit Recht, daß man diese Form jetzt nur noch im Munde älterer Bürger höre, was auf dasselbe hinauskommt, wie unsere Behauptung, daß sie nie eigentlich volksmäßig gewesen ist."

Falkenſtein[1]): Do wart irer einer erſtochen; und ê denne er *ersturbe*, do fragetent in die unſeren .. sp. 1303; der *pliese ein* hörnelîn sp. 1308; Und alſo nâment ſiu den vor genanten Hans Snîder, und *stiesse in* (for ſtießent) dâ hinâch 1305; Da *gienge* ſiu mit irem krangken lîbe von Frîburg und fand iren Mann sp. 1306. There are several examples of wurde that might be indicative forms. The subjunctives of st. prts. retain the final -e and the radical vowel has the umlaut sign. There is no levelling except in case of the e-forms.

III. Gradual increase in number and more general extension. From 1400 to 1500.

In this century the e-forms of the ind. st. prt. become much more common than in the previous century. However, not until after the advent of printing do we find any great percentage of these forms. Whether there is any causal connection between the rapid rise in the use of these e-forms at this time and the general extension of printing, or whether the connection is merely a chronological coincidence, is hard to say. In my opinion, there is some causal relation. The great difference between the high average percentage of e-forms in printed texts and the low percentage that is found in Mss., even though dating from 50 to 75 years later than the printings, is too striking to be merely accidental.

The following e-forms of the ind. st. prt. occur in Hans von Bühel's *Diocletianus Leben*[2]): hieße: ließe 201, entſlieffe: rieffe 329, lieffen: ſlieffe 1281, ſtieße: enließe 1327 – all indicative, and usually redup. verbs. But, Der keiſer *erschracke aber* ſere 686; Er *schwange* und *schwange* mit grym und ach 1300. Other examples: (*abe:*) gabe 1517, entſlieffe (in line) 1529, laſſe (= las) 1706, fůre (: můre) 1977; but (abe:) (ich) hab 1979. Rarely do

[1]) Wackernagel, *Altd. Lesebuch*, col. 1303 ff. The date is the 14th century and the dialect Alemannic.

[2]) Hrsg. v. A. v. Keller, Quedlinburg 1841. All the examples that occur in the first 2500 lines are given. The date is ca. 1412. H. v. B. lived near Bonn, but his dialect is not Middle-Franconian — apocope is carried to too great an extent for this dialect.

other words take on an extra -e; e. g. worte: gehorte 1965. As a rule only st. prt. ind. forms admit of an extra -e. There is no levelling. Wk. prts. are practically all without -e. Thus, macht 335, zuckt 1407, fürt 1593, rüfft 596 and zogt 2371 are weak forms.

In Conrad von Weinberg's *Einnahmen- und Ausgaben-register*[1]) the following forms in -e are found: gabe (6) 14, name (9) 1, kame (10) 8, ließe (10) 2, ſchancke (16) 1, ſtunde (ind. 30) 1, enphalle (11) 1, leyhe (11) 3, hübe (ind. 16) 1, füre (ind.) 1, — 33 examples in all. In the same section there are 110 regular forms, most of which are in the expression gab ich. Thus over 23 % of all st. prts. ind. 1st and 3rd sing. have -e. Often the -e is added even if the next word begins with a vowel, e. g. gabe ich 8, 14 etc., ließe ich 10, 28, leyhe ich 27 etc. All weak prts. except hete omit -e. There ist no levelling. Some other words take on a superfluous -e, e. g. heime, uſſe (= aus); the expression kame heime occurs frequently.

No example of the form under discussion could be found in Hermann von Sachsenheim's *Mörin*[2]). The rule is for all final e's to be dropped. Not one weak prt. with -e was found. Only one example of levelling was noticed: ritt: mit 514. The old ei of class I. (prt. sing.) is always ai. Such plural forms occur as ſungen 13, bunden 570, wurffen 113, zugen 284, etc.

Chronicles.

Most of the chronicles of the series *Chroniken der deutschen Städte* were examined. Here the occurrence of e-forms is at a minimum, although most of the chronicles are in prose. In some cases there are very few preterites, this form having been supplanted by other tenses, usually the perfect.

Nürnberg.

1. Several instances of e-forms were found in the *Chronik*

[1]) BLV. 18. Bd. Basel 1438. All st. prts. were counted in the first 32 pages.

[2]) Hrsg. v. Ernst Martin BLV. 137. Bd. Date ca. 1453. From Ms. A 2946, Hofbibliothek in Wien. This is a didactic poem of 6081 verses. The dialect is Swabian.

aus Kaiser Sigmunds Zeit bis 1434[1]). The rule seems to have been to permit the -e, with only a few exceptions, only after h. We find ſahe 346, 6, geſchahe 347, 14, verlehe 365, 3 frequently. One example of warde occurs, 365, 1. The percentage of all e-forms is very slight. No levelling was detected. All wk. prts. omit -e, e. g. pracht 361, 17, verprant 362, 7 etc., but the final -e of nouns is generally retained, as reiſe, etc.

2. No ind. st. prts. in -e could be found in Endres Tucher's *Memorial*[2]). Such forms as ſach, geſchach, fros (11, 6) was, etc. occur.

3. In *Nürnbergs Krieg gegen den Markgrafen Albrecht von Brandenburg*[3]) several instances occur: ſahe 124, 24, geſchahe aber 161, 21, zohe er 155, 11 etc. Each of these occurs several times. No examples of ſach or geſchach were found but zoch 155, 12. Only one example other than h-stems was found: bote 127, 15. There is some levelling, e. g. trib 140, 28 but rait 152, 4; reit 125, 7 etc. In the plural we find riten 156, 8, zugen 148, 4, funden 166, 1, luffen (= lieffen) 157, 7 etc. Weak prts. all omit -e, e. g. bracht, beſtellt 125, 22 verclagt 138, 10 etc. Likewise with the prt. subj. sing. of st. verbs, as würd 125, 24 etc. On the other hand, there is very little apocope of -e in nouns, e. g. ſache 126, 3 etc.

4. In Sigmund Meisterlin's *Chronik der Reichsstadt Nürnberg*[4]), only two examples were found: lehe 106, 20 and kame 66, 23. There is considerable levelling. Thus we find ſtrit 57, 2, but lait 57, 19, ſchreib 87, 14, ſchraib 57, 25 etc. In the plural of class II. we find zogen 41, 13 as well as zugen. Class III. shows many examples of the sing. vowel taken into the plural, as warfen 87, 5; warden 59, 24 is almost the exclusive form. There is very little apocope of -e except in wk. prts., most of which drop the -e.

Bavarian cities.

No e-forms of the st. prt. could be found in any of the

---

[1]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 1.
[2]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 2. Date 1421—1440.
[3]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 2. 1449, 1450.
[4]) Hrsg. v. M. Lexer, Ch. D. S. From Ms., date 1488.

Bavarian chronicles. This is quite different from the situation in the 12th and 13th centuries.

1. In the *Mühldorfer Annalen*[1]) there is no levelling. We find hub 385, 23 and hueb 384, 16 both ind., ſtarb and ſtarib 386, 31, ſtrait 384, 1, and rait 384, 11. Almost all wk. prts. omit -e, e. g. macht 387, 24, chauft 387, 6 etc.

2. In the Landshut[2]) chronicle there is levelling between war 287, 11 and was 298, 9, was being the usual form. No levelling of radical vowels was detected in any class. We find geſchach 313, 26, ſchlueg 315, 20, belaib 300, 25 etc. as ind. forms. Weak prts. usually omit final -e, e. g. ſatzt 297, 5, ſchickt 316, 23 etc. There is not much apocope of -e in nouns and inflectional endings other than that of wk. prts.

3. There is much levelling in Leonhard Widmann's *Chronik von Regensburg*[3]). In class I. the old ei has given place to i from the plural, e. g. blib 185, 17, ritt 176, 7, ſtieg 23, 2. was is regular but war 16, 21 occurs. ſach and geſchach 29, 13 are exclusive forms. In the plural we find: zohen 182, 11, wurffen, waſend 25, 32 etc. There is very much apocope, e. g. dieser gut alt vater 28, 28, die Sach 16, 21 etc. Almost all weak prts. omit -e.

Augsburg.

No e-forms of the st. prt. ind. are found in the Augsburg chronicles until 1470. The first levelling is found in Erhard Wahrau's Chronicle[4]), in the plural only. For instance we find zugen (usual) and zogen 227, 16, numen 227, 17, — a verb of class IV., analogous to the plural of class III.; ſturben, wurden etc. are exclusive forms. Most weak prts. ind. and prt. subjs. of strong verbs 1. 3. sing. omit -e.

Considerable levelling occurs in the *Chronik der Gründung der Stadt Augsburg bis zum Jahre 1469*[5]). Thus we find in class I ſchraib 288, 3 (always), erſchain 291, 4; 295, 16, but erſchin 292, 7, laid 290, 1, raitt 312, 12, but beſtritt 297, wich 307,

[1]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 15. 1313—1428. Date of composition ca. 1428.
[2]) Ibid 1439—1505.
[3]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 15. 1511—43, 1552—55. From Ms.
[4]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 4. 1126—1445. Date of composition 1462.
[5]) Ibid. p. 263 ff.

5, blib 310, 12, etc. There is no levelling in the other classes e. g. ward – wurden, fand – funden, etc.

Several examples of e-forms occur in Burkhard Zink's Chronicle[1]), nearly all of which are in the rubrics. In the first 50 pages we find warde (1, 17; 4, 24 etc.) 5 times, wurde (19, 26), and name (11, 24) twice. Euphony is not considered, e. g. warde es 49, 31 etc. There is the same levelling in the first class that we find above. In class II. the u of the plural is often taken into the sing., as verdruß 7, 17, zug 21, 12 (often): in the plural the u is generally retained as zugen 4, 7, ſchluſſen 20, 14, fluhen 20, 21 etc. In class III. the plural vowel often goes over into the sing. e. g. wurd 10, 3, fund 35, 6 etc. and vice versa warden 3, 16; 33, 28 etc., but funden 4, 7, wurden 9, 12. In class IV. we find nomen 17, 14, with the vowel of the p. part. war and was both occur (21, 31; 1, 16). In the plural waſen 33, 18. In class VI, hueb 1, 4, fuer, lued, ſchlueg, etc. As a rule weak prts. omit -e.

No examples occur in Konrad Stolle's Chronicle[2]). From p. 1 to p. 15 142 st. prts. without -e occur and not one with -e; in the same section 92 weak prts. with -e and not one without -e occur. There is some levelling but only in the plural. The vowel of the p. part. is frequently taken into the plural prt., e. g. holfen 3, worden, but never in case of funden 2, bunden 6, etc. In class IV. we find quomen, nomen; class V., erſchrocken, ſprochen 7, etc. There is practically no apocope of final -e. All infinitives drop final -n. worde 5, ſtorbe 7, worffe, worbe 13, etc. without umlaut sign are subj. forms.

In the Chrnnicle of Maintz[3]) several instances of the st. prt. ind. in -e occur, but only in 3 verbs: ſtunde ein zweitracht 6, 22; ſtunde 28, 22; 118, 20, gienge 166, 29, and riede in 37, 5. There are very few preterites, the perfect being used instead. The weak prt. often omits -e but not as a rule. We find gedachte, wolde, muſte, irwecket, ſagete in 62, 28 etc. There is very little apocope of -e. Subj. prts. strong retain -e.

---

[1]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 5. Date about 1470. From Ms.

[2]) Thuringian, Erfurt. From the original Ms. Hrsg. v. L. F. Hesse BLV. 32. Bd. The chronicle was finished about 1499.

[3]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 17. 1332—1452. Date of composition about middle of the 15th century.

No st. prts. ind. in -e occur in the *Braunschweig Chronik*[1]). Apocope is at a minimum here. All weak prts. retain -e. Usually the connecting vowel -e- is retained, even where it is elided in Modern German, e. g. makede, horede, etc.

One example of the form under discussion was found in the Spiegel der Laien[2]) up de tit do Jhēsus mit Marien und Jōseph in Egipten *vlōe*. No extended study of Low German has been made. Enough work has been done, however, to find out that these e-forms of the st. prt. are very rare in the North-German dialects.

The following are all the examples that occur in *Bruder Rausch*[3]) hete (= hieß) 19, lete (= ließ) 87, but let 149, 286 etc., beide (ind.): heiden 251: men *hete en* willekamen sin 357.

In *Reinke de Vos*[4]) there are no ind. e-forms of the st. prt. unless we consider scheden a strong verb, as, mit sodan worden schiede he van dan 1366; schede 2264; wo Reinke orlof nam unde scheide ut 3855, etc. In his vocabulary p. 316 Lübben gives for scheden: schw. v. Praet. scheidede u. scheide. The weak form is very rare in Reinke de Vos, scheide being the usual form. This verb is strong in the other dialects and may be strong here with occasionally a weak form. Of course scheide could be a contraction from scheidede, just as we often meet such forms as antworte for antwortete, etc. On the other hand it could very easily be the strong form with an additional -e.

One instance of the ind. st. prt. in -e was found in Low-Franconian: genase, Germ. 26, 361, line 30 (14th century).

In Georg von Ehingen's *Reisen nach der Ritterschaft*[5]) many e-forms occur. The statistics below are based upon the section pp. 1—28, in which all preterites, strong and weak, were counted.

[1]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 6. 15th century.

[2]) Zs. f. d. Ph. 6, 437. No. 111. Münstersche Hs. vom J. 1444. I am indebted to Professor Collitz for this example.

[3]) DNL. 11. Bd. Hrsg. v. F. Bobertag. 15th century printing, exact date and place of printing unknown.

[4]) Nach der ältesten Ausgabe, Lübeck 1498. Hrsg. v. August Lübben, Oldenburg 1867.

[5]) BLV. Vol. 1. From the Ms. now in Stuttgart Library. The date is 1455, and the dialect Swabian. Written in prose.

geſchah	14	geſchahe 2, 26 . . .	1
ſtarb	5	ſtarbe 3, 11	1
belib	1	belibe 3, 36	5
ritt 2, rait (10, 36) .	3	ritte er 5, 8	1
hielt	10	hielte 7, 3	1
gab	16	gabe 7, 17	8
ward	55	warde 8, 1	2
total	104		19

Thus about 15% of all st. prts. ind. of these verbs that have e-forms in the prt. at all take on the extra -e. In the whole section read 294 st. prts. without -e and 19 with -e occur, or over 6% of all st. prts. ind. 1st and 3rd sing. have final -e. In the same section 160 weaks prts. 1st and 3rd sing. without -e and 41 with final -e occur, that is, only about 20% of all weak prts. retain final -e.

Class I. is about completely levelled between sing. and plural, and in favor of the plural vowel. Only 2 examples of the old ei (ai) in the sing. were noted: ſchrai and rait 10, 36. Numerous instances of the other forms occur: ritt, ſchied, belib, riß, ſtrit, ſchrib, etc. The sing. vowel is never taken into the plural. There is practically no levelling in the other classes. Thus we have: zoch – zugen (10, 9) always, fand – funden (10, 10), verluren (27), etc. But ſtand (4, 8) 4 times, ſtund once (16, 3), ſtonden 24, 29. There is some confusion of weak and strong conjugations, e. g. ruofft (9, 9) always; prt. begapt (14, 17), etc. This is exceeding early for levelling to be carried to such a great extent. Compare this with the usage in Luther nearly a century later. war is almost the exclusive form, occurring 62 times to was 4 times (e. g. 5,16). Compare this with the extent that was is used by Hans Sachs and Fischart over a century later. There is much apocope of -e. No extra e's are added except to st. prts. and darabe (10, 8). Most prt. subjs. strong omit final -e.

Fastnachtsspiele[1]).

Only two examples of e-forms of the st. prt. ind. were noted in Part I of Keller's Fastnachtspiele: *aine*: *uberschaine* 1,

[1]) Adelbert von Keller, *Fastnachtsp. aus dem 15ten Jh.* BLV. Vols. 28, 28, 30. Nos. 28 and 29 contain only the anonymous plays, most of which can be ascribed to one of the following: Rosenblut, Folz, Schernberg, or Gegenbach (s. III., 1077). These men are usually mentioned in

394, 7 and ſchiede 453, 16. Only one example could be found in Part II.: *kame*: namen 566, 5. No levelling could be detected. Old ei of class I is usually written ai, e. g. traib I, 438, 31, ſlaich II, 756, 4, but greif II, 758, 24, vertreib I, 495, 32, etc. ſach and geſchach are usual, but Da ſah ich II, 754, 25. Old uo is, as a rule, written ue, e. g. hueb 460, 16, ſchlueg 486, 1 but ſchluoch 446, 34. There is much apocope but not so much as is found farther south in the same period, Here, contrary to the general Alemannic and Bavarian custom, final -e is often retained in pres. ind. 1st person of verbs and in the dative sing. of nouns. In the poems ascribed to Rosenblut in Part III. the e-forms are much more common. In most cases they occur right at the beginning of the poem, and only there. It may have been felt as "high style" to use the e-forms. Further on in the poem the writer would drop back into his ordinary style. This is also the case in Hans Folz. The following examples are found in Rosenblut: geſchae: ſahe III, 1107; wurde er III, 178 but wurd, III, 1188; clage: *geschahe*, 1331 — first two lines of Von dem Wolf; Ich gienge eins nachts — at the beginning of Die Stiefmutter, 1331. The proportion of all st. prts. that have -e is very slight. There is considerable levelling: ſchlich, ſchnit 1144, but graif 1094, ſchraib 1096, lanḍ 1097, lant 1098, ſchneid 1148, reit 1142; zoch 1094, zohen 1141; ſungen 1125, ſtarben 1132; ſach is usual but ſah 1124; was occurs exclusively.

In Hans Folz the following examples are found: *warte*: harte and finge an (in first lines of Ein liet genant der pöß rauch, in der flam weiß. III. 1279); kame 1296; tage: *pflage* (at the beginning of *Ystori vom Römischen Reich.* Date, 1480). There is some levelling in class I: *rit*: mit 1310, ſchreyb 1198, pleib: beſchreib 1221, etc.; ſanden 1213; was is usual but gar: *war* in Der kargen Spiel.

One example of the st. prt. ind. in -e was found in Ulrich Fueterer's *Lanzelot*[1]): lage p. 30. There are thousands of

connection with the Fastnachtspiele of the 15th century. All the plays given by Keller are from Nürnberg. Vol. 30 contains the Spiele and Sprüche that are assigned to the various authors, Rosenblut, Folz, etc. Vol. 46, which is also in the collection, was not examined.

[1]) Prose romance of the last of the 15th century. BLV. 175. Bd. Nach der Donaueschinger Hs. Bavarian dialect.

regular forms of the st. prt. There is no levelling in class I. In the plural of class II we find ſluhen 11, zohen 15, but zugen 31. rufen is always weak. We find here the usual South-German apocope.

Medieval Drama.

The following examples occur in the *Frankfurter Passionspiel*[1]) dreyhe 799, he ſprache 818, he wurde yn . . . 822, lage er 1708, ſtarbe: warb 1708, wurde 1727, riede 1870, lichnam: *name* 1909, name 2393, bade (= bat) 2507, ich *rieffe* "Davidis ſone" und *bade in* . . . 3322; ich bade in, das 3330; kame 4210. These are all the e-forms that occur in all 4408 lines. One often finds no -e where he would expect it to be added, e. g. *quam*: lame 870, 3328; *was*: haſſe 1353, etc. The latest instances of the 2nd p. ind. of the st. prt. sing. in -e that I have found occur in this play, -e being the almost exclusive 2nd p. ending, e. g. du wurde 3684, ginge du 4335, ginge 2604, du ſluge 2606, etc. There is very little apocope of -e. No levelling could be detected except in wurde.

Several e-forms are found in the *Alsfeld Passion Play*[2]), but only in case of nasal and liquid stems: *vorname*: man: beſann 2390, quame ich 2799, ich ſale (soll) 3720, 3740 etc., *vorhale*: uberal 3544, *gebarre eins* kyndes lipp 4726, *gebare*: gar 6062. These are all the examples that occur in the whole play.

No examples of the form in question occur in the *Wiener Osterspiel*[3]) but we find indications of levelling e. g. fanden 102, 144. Nor do any e-forms occur in the *Redentiner Osterspiel*[4]). We find here no evidences of levelling.

Several instances of the st. prt. ind. in -e occur in *Der Seele Trost*[5]): do zobarſde hei unzwei I, 193, 11, parſte (sic) I,

[1]) Published by R. Froning in *Das Drama des Mittelalters*, Kürschner DNL. 141, II and III. The Frankfurt Passionplay is from a Ms. bearing the date 1493.

[2]) Froning II, III. From a Ms. of the last of the 15th century. It is in verse, as are all the plays of the series under consideration.

[3]) Froning I. From a Ms. 1472.

[4]) Froning I. 1464. Redentin in Mecklenburg.

[5]) In Frommann's *Deutsche Mundarten* I and II. *Der Seele Trost* is a collection of didactic stories in prose. Köln, 15th century. From manuscript. All the examples are given that could be found in the selections given by Frommann.

225, 66; Der pais *gave eme* einen brief I, 196, 17, vloe I, 200, 25. In this last example the -e may be merely orthographic as also zoe, doe, etc., I, 202, 28 and elsewhere. Other examples: dat groive (grub) he up I, 213, 52, but groif si up I, 214; droige he I, 215, 55, droige it I, 222, erſloige und I, 223, 64, reide II, 1, 69, ſloige und I, 225, 66, II, 6, 75, II, 80, verloire II, 11, 80. Other examples are found in a selection from the same in Wackernagel's *Altd. Lesebuch*, e. g. betroge Amelius sp. 1314, dreibe in uſz sp. 1315, aſſe er sp. 1316. There is some levelling but only in class I, e. g. bliff (= blieb) I, 206, 34, ſchriff (= schrieb) I, 209, 42, begriff I, 216; reit, bleif, etc. are usual. All weak prts. retain -e. There is practically no apocope of -e.

Die Erste Deutsche Bibel[1]).

In Matthew and Mark combined 1033 examples of st. prts. without -e occur, and 41 with -e. The following with -e occur in Matthew: ſtunde auf 33, 44, gienge aus 108, 15, ſchiede 15, 35, ſache 107, 5, ſahe OOa 79, 61, ſprache 42, 23, ſteige 28, 7, ſtaige 31, 31, ſchlieffe 30, 6, vergabe im 70, 33, aſſe 43, 44, faſſe 48, 32, faſſe an 109, 54, gezame 98, 46, hienge 108, 28. The following are some of the examples from Mark: ſahe, wurffe Z—Oa 171, 41, gienge 122, 43, rieffe er 122, 51, lage 123, 11, ſchiede 124, 34. Thus in these two books about 4% of all st. prts. 1st and 3rd sing. ind. end in -e. There is very little levelling[2]). Apocope is carried

[1]) Hrsg. v. W. Kurrelmeyer. BLV. Vol. 234ff. The references are to page and line, unless otherwise specified.

[2]) This applies only to M, the earliest printing and to a few subsequent printings. Below is a list of the various printings and some variant readings to illustrate the matter of levelling. M, Erste deutsche Bibel, Straßburg ca. 1466; E, Eggensteyn, Straßburg ca. 1470 (?); P, Pflanzmann, Augsburg ca. 1473 (?); Z, Zainer, Augsburg ca. 1475; Za, reprint of Z; A, die Schweizerbibel; S, Sorg, Augsburg 1477; Zc, Zweite Ausgabe von Zainer 1477; Sa, zweite Ausgabe von Sorg, 1480; K, Koburger, Nürnberg 1483; G, Grüninger, Straßburg 1485; Sb, Schönsperger, Augsburg 1487; Sc, zweite Ausgabe Schönsperger, Augsburg 1490; O, H. Otmar, Augsburg 1507; Oa, Silvanus Otmar, Augsburg 1518. The references are to chapter and verse. Jerem. 50, 7 fanden, Zc Sa, others funden; 51, 7 tranden Z—Sc (OOa u); 36, 20 enpfullen MEWZ—Sa, empfallen K—Oa; 37, 14 warden Z—KSb—O; 38, 6 warffen Z—Oa, wurffen MEP; warden occurs in Zc Sa alone 52, 23, 25, 30, 34; Lam. 2, 8 fanden Zc Sa; 2, 19 verdarben Zc Sa, also 4, 5; 4, 9 warden Zc Sa, so 5, 5; 4, 9 ſtarben Zc Sa. Thus we see that levelling in the plural

to a great extent. The subj. prt., strong and weak, may or may not have -e. Most weak preterites drop the -e, as the figures from Luke will show. In this book 298 weak prts. without -e and 18 with -e occur, or only about 6% of all weak prts. retain the -e. In this same book 21 st. prts. 1st and 3rd sing. ind. have -e. No account was taken of the number of regular forms. A few examples of the e-forms are given: warde 212, 5 Z—Oa. aſſe 212, 5, hůbe 224, 7, ſprache 229, 2, gienge in 229, 51, ſaſſe 229, 61, entſchlieffe 237, 26, ſteige ab 237, 27, etc. The following are found in John: ſteige auf 351, 45, niederſteige 360, 12, kame 365, 50, gienge jetzunt 386, 29. In Tobias (vol. 7) the following are found: flohe allein 3, 51, gienge 9, 61; 16, 31, beleibe in 10, 2; 16, 32, rieffe 11, 37, briefe 17, 44, etc.

Das Deutsche Heldenbuch [1]).

In the prose summary of 11 pages at the beginning of this, 4 examples of the st. prt. in -e occur: belibe 8, 7, geſtarbe 8, 8, ſahe 10, 22, fienge er 11, 2. Only 4 cases occur in the first 72 pages of verse: wurde 59, 14, *empfinge*: klinge 53, 37, ſahe 61, 28, *beite*: wyderſeite. The forms in -e occur much more frequently in the prose rubrics throughout the poem, e. g. gabe er 42, lage es 126, 4, anſache 154, 3, empfinge 170, erſache 342, etc. There is some levelling e. g. greiff 49, 6; 53, 22 beite 69, 6, beleib: ſchreib 26, 28, but belibe 8, 7, griff 44, 13; zugen 88, 28;

---

of class III does not occur before Z. It is most frequent in Zc and Sa. Very little evidence of levelling in the other classes was detected. In case of the e-forms of the prt. ind. almost nothing can be made out of the variant readings of the different editions. The critical readings for Matthew will illustrate. The references are to page and line. 12, 27 ſchied M—S—Oa, ſchiede Zc Sa; 15, 35 ſchiede all; 28, 27 ſteige all; 30, 6 ſchlieffe M—P, ſchlieff Z—Oa; 31, 31 ſtaige auf all; 32, 44 ſtunde auf all; 43, 44 aſſe all; 48, 32 ſaſſe all; 60, 60 ſprache all; 66, 54 tratte K—Oa, others have a different word; 70 33 vergabe im all; 79, 61 erſahe einen OOa, others ſach; 97, 22 gienge all; 98, 46 gezame all; 107, 5 ſache in all; 108, 15 gienge aus all; 108, 27 gienge hin all; 108, 28 hinge all; 109, 51 ſprache M—P, ſprach Z—Oa; 109, 54 ſaſſe an all; 110, 6 fienge M, others have a different word; 113, 61 ſchray Za S K G Sc, ſchry Zc Sa Sb OOa.

[1]) Neu herausgegeben von A. v. Keller BLV. 87. Bd. According to the earlist printing G, place of printing and date unknown. According to Goedecke and Martin it was Straßburg 1477 (see Keller 765). Otherwise Zarncke in Germania 1, 62.

ſungen 34, 2, wurden 50, 40 etc. are the usual forms, but warden 10, 37, halffen 26, 15 etc. ſach is the regular form. was occurs exclusively, waſen 52, 20. The pres. inf. very often drops the final -n, e. g. erwinde 30, 17, treibe 30, 33, ſaume 69, 16, finde 98, 18 — a fact, together with the fact that î and û have become ei and au, that seems to indicate that it is not a Straßburg printing. As late as 1494 we have the long vowels î and û kept throughout (e. g. in Brant's *Narrenschiff*) in Straßburg. The omission of -n of the inf. is not characteristic of Straßburg, but occurs very frequently in the Thuringian dialect at this time.

Decameron.

In the prose translation of the Decameron[1]) a very high percentage of e-forms is found. I give below some statistics.

a) liquids l. r.			
No regular forms occur		fiele 36, 31	5
		fure 36, 24	2
b) nasals m, n			
kam	43	kame, kome 19, 23 . .	11
nam	31	name 30, 21	13
gewan	3	ſchiene 44, 13 . . .	1
	77		25
c) labials, 1. b			
gab	20	gabe 21, 6	31
hub	15	hube 21, 11	14
ſtarb	1	ſtarbe 27, 17 . . .	3
treyb	1	treibe 30, 11 . . .	1
beleib	2	ſchobe 45, 29 . . .	1
2. f			
greyff	1	greiffe 31, 18 . . .	2
ſchuff	1	ſchufe 33, 25	7
halff	2	halffe 57, 8	1
lieff	1	lieffe 62, 24	1
ſchlief	1		
	6		11

[1]) Long supposed to be by Steinhöwel, but now generally admitted to have been made by Arigo (see p. 32 below). Published by A. v. Keller in BLV. Vol. 51 as belonging to Steinhöwel. I take it up in this order because of convenience in comparing it with Steinhöwel's *Aesop* in regard to the -e of the st. prt. My results confirm the contention that the *Decamerone* and the *Aesop* are not by the same author. The Decameron was printed at Ulm by Johann Zainer of the 70's of the 15th century. My statistics are for pp. 18—73.

d) gutturals 1. g

		betroge 19, 8	1
ging	14	ginge 19, 24	28
lag	2	lage 22, 4	2
		ſchluge 24, 37	2
fing	1	finge 27, 15	9
		range 27, 16	1
		ſteyge 38, 7	2
		klange 51, 2	1
trug	3	truge 56, 24	1
zwang	1		
	21		47

2. h, ch.

		floche 20, 15	1
ſprach	117	ſprache 23, 9	15
		geſchahe 27, 2	1
geſchach	1	geſchache 37, 25	1
		ſahe 35, 14	4
ſach	9	ſache 31, 29	19
		zoche 39, 26	8
ſtach	1	ſtache 43, 32	1
	128		50

e) dentals 1. d

ward	29	warde 19, 13	36
fand	4	fande 19, 18	11
		ſchiede 27, 17	4
ſtund	2	ſtunde 27, 32	12
	35		63

2. t

		ſchalte 26, 11	1
pat	4	pate 29, 27	3
reyt	2	reyte 31, 11	10
		gepote 38, 38	10
hielt	3	hielte 48, 6	2
all others	2		
	11		26

f) ſ-stems 1. ſ

waz, was	190	verloſe 65, 7	1

2. ſſ

ließ	3	lieſſe 24, 6	12
ſaß	5	ſaſſe 21, 11	13
		aſſe 41, 18	2
	8		27

Summary.

Stems in	without -e	with -e	per cent
l, r	0	7	100
m, n	77	25	24
b	39	50	56
f	6	11	65
g	21	47	69
h, ch	128	50	28
d	35	63	64
t	11	26	70
s	190	1	1/2
ss	8	27	77
total	515	307	37

If was and ſprach are left out of account, over 58 % of all st. prts. ind. end in -e. As a rule weak prts. omit -e. There is practically no levelling of sing. and plural vowels. ei or ey is without exception the radical vowel of the sing. of class I. No evidence of levelling in any class was seen except in class II — zugen (usual) and zogen 66, 38. No forms as warden, ſangen, ſchworen, etc. occur. Occasionally other words besides st. prts. take on an extra -e, e. g. palde, inne, tode (nom.), ſchnelle, etc., but as a rule only st. prts. ind. 1st and 3rd sing. permit -e.

In a translation by Steinhöwel, his *Aesop*[1]), made at about the same time as the *Decameron* and said to been printed by the same printer at Ulm, the e-forms occur very rarely. Out of a total of 255 st. prts. 1st and 3rd sing. ind. that occur in the section pp. 78—136 only 9 have final -e. These are: warde (88) 1, erlaide (89) 1, ſchiede (93) 1, batte (123) 2, ſtieße (99) 1, ſahe (104) 1, lage 1, laſe (133) 1 — a little over 3 %. This difference between the use of e-forms in the *Aesop* and in the *Decameron* is inexplicable unless we assume that either they are by two different translators or were printed by different printers. The latter is out of the question altogether. Were the two translations made by the same man, it would be almost unthinkable that the same printer, issuing both

[1]) Hrsg. v. Hermann Oesterley. BLV. 117. Bd. According to O. the *Aesop* was printed at Ulm by Johann Zeiner in the 70's of the 15th century. Steinhöwel was born in Swabia in 1420. He graduated in medicine at Padua and settled as a physican at Esslingen. In 1450 he moved to Ulm where he remained until his death in 1482.

perhaps in the same year, should make such a great difference in the language in each case. Such an event is of course possible, but highly improbable. By far the more reasonable assumption is that the translations are by different authors.

Other examples in *Aesop*: ſtieße 157, verpande 170, gefiele 178, gienge 183, luffe (= lieffe) 184.

There is also a very great difference between the *Aesop* and the *Decameron* in regard to levelling. As was shown above, in the *Decameron* there is practically no levelling of radical vowels of sing. and plural. In the Aesop, on the contrary, there is much levelling. This is especially true of class I. Here without exception we have the plural vowel taken into the sing., e. g. ergrif 98, riß 118, belib 153, zig (= zieh) 133, wich, etc. There is also considerable levelling in the plural of class III. Here it is in favor of the sing. vowel, e. g. ſprangen 120, bargen 120, but bunden 101. In class II. there is also some levelling, as, zohen 86, flohen 112, u being the rule. This, with the other differences, makes it very probable that the *Decameron* and the *Aesop* are not the work of the same printer, or are by different authors, — very probably the latter.

In the 1490 version of the *Aesop*[1]) the e-forms occur much more frequently than in the Ulm version but not nearly so often as in the Ulm printing of the *Decameron*.

Contemporary with Steinhöwel and Arigo, Niclas von Weil shows no e-forms whatever. All of his translations as published by Keller[2]) were examined carefully and not a single st. prt. ind. ending in -e was found. One wonders why

---

[1]) Printed at Basel. A selection from this version is contained in Wackernagel's *Altd. Lesebuch*, col. 1439ff.

[2]) BLV. Vol. 57. This is a reprint of A, the oldest printing, perhaps made at Esslingen by K. Fyner 1478. At this time Swabia is the district in which the greatest percentages of the use of e-forms of the st. prt. occur. The fact that Niclas von Weil does not employ them may perhaps be accounted for by the fact that he was not a native of Swabia. In his Translations p. 350 he says: "Ich bin bürtig von Bremgarten usz dem Ergöw: und hab mich anefangs, als ich in Schwäben kam, großes flyßes gebrucht, daz ich gewonte ze schriben ai fur ei". He says nothing, however, about the e-forms of the st. prt. that are so prevalent in his time around him. He does, however, combat the use of final -e in all places where it is used

such a marked difference in this regard exists between him and Steinhöwel and Augo, or between the printers. In each case it is prose translations from foreign languages, each printed in Swabia and that in or near the 70's of the 15th century. It is hardly possible to ascribe all the difference to the printers. Niclas von Weil did not follow the popular movement but very probably felt this -e, along with most other e's in final position, to be foreign to the South-German dialect and accordingly treated this -e like the rest, — that is, he dropped it.

Arigo: *Blumen der Tugend.*

Vogt[1]) would ascribe to "Arigo" both the *Decameron* and the *Blumen der Tugend.* One of the points of similarity that he calls attention to is the use in both of e-forms of the st. prt. Karl Drescher is quite of the same opinion[2]). On p. 203 he gives a list of st. prts. ind. that occur in the *Bl. der Tugend* of Arigo (but not in connection with the question of the identification of him with Steinhöwel): "St. Verba also mit unechtem -e, 22 ꝺhome, 22 umfinge, 22 ſanꝺe, 22 aufgabe, 22 ſtarbe, 22 gabe, 23 warꝺe, 26 ſpracꝺe, 29 aufhube, 30 warffe, 30 fiele, 103 waſe usw. Zusammen ca. 530 Fälle. Die unechten -e sind

---

by the Middle and North-German dialects. In his writings all words of wathever class are as a rule without -e. Practically all weak preterites omit -e.

[1]) Zs. f. dt. Ph. 28, 448—482. The date of the *Blumen der Tugend* is 1468. Among other similarities between the language in the D. and that in the *Bl. d. T.* which Vogt takes as evidence of the identity of the translators, he notes the custom in both of attaching extra e's to words, by Vogt placed all in the same class. After calling attention to the superfluous e's in words other than st. prts., which as a matter of fact are relatively rare, he refers to the e's in the st. prt. 1st and 3rd sing. ind. He says: "Die bekannte Anhängung des e an starke Substantiva ist überaus häufig, zB. Dec. lobe, troſte, wege, note, etc.; TBl puꝺe, teyle, anfange, luſte, etc., aber auch bei dem unflectierten Adj. wird es zugefügt. Beim Verbum sind nicht nur starke Präterita wie ſtarbe, ginge, gabe, floge, warꝺe, ſaꝺe, kome, ſtunꝺe, hube in dem TBl. die Regel, im Dec. mindestens eine ganz gewöhnliche Erscheinung, sind nicht nur Präterita präsentia wie mage, beꝺarffe, wille, weiße, üblich, sondern das e wird auch den verschiedenen Arten des Endungs-t in auffälliger Weise angehängt" — p. 475.

[2]) *Quellen und Forschungen* No. 86. Arigo, der Übersetzer des *Decamerone* und des *Fiore di Virtu.*

also im st. praet. ganz besonders zahlreich". We cannot tell anything about the percentages of e-forms as he gives no figures for the regular st. prts. We can see, however, that it is comparatively high, perhaps as great as that in case of the *Decameron.*

Tristrant und Isalde.

In the first 30 pages of *Tristrant und Isalde*[1]), the following e-forms occur:

fure 17, 16	1	zohe 4, 20	2
name 9, 17	1	geſchahe 6, 15 . . .	3
kame 25, 17	3	ſahe 7, 1	14
gewane 27, 22 . . .	1	warde 1, 11	8
befalhe 5, 11 . . .	2	ſtonde 25, 5	1
ſchüffe 7, 13	1	riete 8, 11	1
truge 17, 24	2	bate 8, 14	3
gienge 21, 16 . . .	2	ließe 27, 17	1

total 46.

In the same section (pp. 1—30) 287 examples of st. prt. ind in -e occur. That is, about 14% of all st. prts. end in -e. The following forms occur for class I: fliß, ſchreib 8, 4, reit 9, 15, belib 15, 24, ſchein 25. 7, ſchneid 27, 24, griff 27, 10 etc. was is the usual form but war 3, 26. No example of ſach or ſah occurs in the section under consideration. Practically all weak prts. omit final -e as well as st. prt. subjs. From critical readings we see that W has many more e-forms than A[2]). There is

---

[1]) Prose romans of the 15th century. Edited by Fr. Pfaff, Tübingen 1881. Pfaff gives the text of A, the Augsburg printing 1498. W is the Worms printing, undated. Relative to the subject of levelling Pfaff says, p. 222: "Eindringen des Pluralvocals des Praet. in den Sing. zeigt W in wurffe, ſprunge, ſchnitte, wurde. reit, ritte, ritt gehen in AW neben einander her. Dagegen braucht W stets das alte beleib, bleibe, ergreiffe (aber doch griff) . . , A beleybe, belib, ergriff. Den Singularvocal in den Pl. eingedrungen zeigt A in vanden." We see from this that the printers at Worms also make a very liberal use of the e-forms of the st. prt. ind.

[2]) Karl v. Bahder, *Grundl. d. neuhochd. Lautsystems* p. 14ff, gives a short history of the various "Druckersprachen". In his discussion of the language of the Augsburg printers, for the period before 1500 he makes no mentions of e-forms of the ind. st. prt. but refers to the interchange of radical vowels e. g. rait, rit, zugen, zogen (p. 18) etc. For the 2nd half of the 16th century he says: "e wird auch öfters angehängt, z. B. wurde". He

very little levelling in A outside of that in class I. With e-forms of the ind. st. prt. there seems to be here as in most places a decided preference for final position in the clause or sentence. No considerations whatever were had for euphony. e. g. warde er 12. 18, befalhe yn 5, 11, ſahe im 19, 2, wiederriete im 8, 11, kame ein Mann 27, 1, ließe er 27, 17 etc. The following sentence defies all rules: Als er do geſehen *ward, warde er* .... gelobt. 9, 16.

In "*Die cronica van der hilliger stat van Coellen*" [1]) printed in Köln by Koelhoff in the year 1499 the forms in question occur frequently. No statistics were made. The percentage of such forms may be estimated at 3 or 4% of all st. prts. Some examples are given: entſtonde ein 648, 13, hielde auch 658, 30, afſtonde ein 648, 13, hielte 666, 13, ſtunde 729, 37, verlore 665, zoighe 719, 34, wurde 724, 9 etc.

There is practically no levelling except in the plural of class III, where the plural often has the vowel of the p. part., e. g. ſtorven 667, 22 etc. but (usually) ſturven 664, 11. All weak prts. retain -e. There is no apocope of final -e in any class of words.

No st. prts. ind. 1st and 3rd sing. in -e occur in the language of Berthold von Chiemsee [2]), nor in the selections given in Wackernagel's *Altd. Lesebuch* from Petermann Ettelin's *Chronik der Eidgenossenschaft* (Basel 1507) and from Geiler v. Kaisersberg's "*Der Has im Pfeffer*", Straßburg 1511.

In Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff* [3]) no e-forms occur. Here apocope of -e is at its height. Practically every -e, inflectional or otherwise, is dropped. This is in no way due to negligence, as it is well known that Brant exercised a close supervision over the printing of his *Narrenschiff*. There is no levelling. The ei of the sing. of class I is retained without exception.

---

has surely overlooked the fact that in the 1498 printing referred to above many e-forms occur. It seems that as 14% of all st. prts. in this have -e, he should have noticed and noted the occurrence of such forms in Augsburg printings before the middle of the 16th century.

[1]) Ch. D. S. Vol. 14. Köln No. 3.

[2]) At least there is no mention of such forms in W. F. Lubke's extended study of the language of Berthold, *Mod. Phil.* X, 208ff.

[3]) Kürschner DNL. 16 B. Basel 1494.

IV. Great frequency of occurrence. From 1500 to 1600.

In this century the forms of the st. prt. in -e are extended very much over tho whole of Germany. This is due largely to the extension of printing, the practices of the printers of one locality being copied more or less by those in another locality. This applies, in my opinion, especially to the use of e-forms of the st. prt. by the printers of South-Germany, particularly of the Alemannic and Swabian cities. Although the printers, as well as the authors, of Middle and North-Germany make use of these forms, their use of them at no time ever reached very high percentages as compared to the usage in the South. Thus we see Luther making a slight use of these forms, in my opinion, whether in him or his printer, a conscious borrowing from the Oberdeutsch. But this in Luther is confined to a very few forms, two or three of which however are used almost exclusively. Although never used to a great extent in a large part of Germany, yet in the 16th century these e-forms were extended more or less all over Germany. But withal, the South-German dialects still maintain by far the distinction of being the great center of these e-forms.

No example of the form under discussion could be found in Thomas Murner's *Narrenbeschwörung*[1]), although Balke calls attention to the occurrence of such forms in the poem, citing as an example geſchahe but giving no reference. Such forms do occur in Murner but very rarely unless we identify Murner with the author of Till Eulenspiegel. The variation between the usage of e-forms of the st. prt. in Murner's poems and that in Till Eulenspiegel would not militate against the view that Murner is the author of the latter, knowing as we do the great difference in this regard between prose and verse. Shumway[2]) calls attention to several instances but gives no references. The examples that he gives are for only classes I

[1]) Straßburg 1512. DNL. 17. Bd. Edited by G. Balke.

[2]) Daniel B. Shumway, *The verb in Thomas Murner.* Americana Germanica I, No. 3 p. 17 ff.

and III, — verliche, verlyhe, lyhe and only one example in class III: halfe.

In *Till Eulenspiegel*[1]) 2122 st. prts. without -e and 71 with -e occur, or nearly 4% have -e. I give some of the examples of the e-forms; trůge 22, 15, gienge 43, 36, fienge 24, 13, trange 63, 17, zohe 28, 17, flohe 44, 20, ſahe 27, 7, ſtůnde 35, 12, bande 28, 12, bote 48, 31, ließe 54, 10, goſſe 57, 35, lieffe 46, 7 etc. The following figures relative to levelling might be of interest: was 216, war (24, 2) 11; ſah, ſach 54, ſahe 27. In class I we find bleib 16, blib 2; treib (27, 29) 6, trib (24, 26) 3; ſchneid (25, 18) 12, ſchnitt 3 — never ſchneit or ſchnid, ſteig 5 ſtig 1; ſchweig (38, 16) 14, ſchwig 2, etc. Thus in class I the ei predominates. In class II there is some levelling chiefly in the plural. For the sing. zug and ſut occur once each; in the plural zohen and zugen are about aqually divided. No example of the plural vowel taken into the sing. of class III occurs. The a of the sing. in liquid+cons. stems is frequently taken into the plural, e. g. warden 24, 16 (the usual form) and halffen 22, 21, etc., but never in case of the nasal+cons. stems, e. g. ſungen 58, 7, ſprungen 58, 7, trungen 59, 26 etc. All the e-forms with only one exception have the vowel of the sing. In every case of levelling, if there is a difference of radical consonants, the radical consonant always follows the radical vowel, e. g. ſchneid but ſchnitt always. zoh, zoch but zug, ſod (usual) but ſut; plural zohen and zugen, never zuhen or zogen. In class VI ſtůnd is usual, but once ſtôt 30, 10. There is very much apocope of final -e. Over 50% of all weak prts. drop the -e. The prt. subj. of strong verbs (1st and 3rd sing.) generally omits -e and very frequently the umlaut sign is also dropped.

In the *Pfarrer von Kalenberg*[2]) all weak prts. drop final -e, as well a most st. prt. subjs. 1st and 3rd sing. There is much apocope of -e. Among hundreds of examples of ind. st. prts. no e-forms occur.

In the *Histori Peter Lewen des andern Kalenbergs*[3]) many

[1]) Straßburg 1515. Kürschner DNL. 25. Bd. *Volksbücher des 16ten Jahrhunderts.* Hrsg. v. F. Bobertag.

[2]) End of 15th or beginning of 16th century. Vienna printing. In verse. DNL. 11. Bd. Hrsg. v. F. Bobertag.

[3]) Frankfurt ca. 1557. Also in verse. DNL. 11. Bd. Ed. F. Bobertag.

e-forms occur, but they comprise only a small percentage of all st. prts. All that occur in the whole poem are given: wurde ein 71 (wurd ihr 279, wurd alles 720); wurd is the usual form 365, 833, 1045 etc.; ward is very rare; erſchrackte: packte 183; aſſe 496, begabe 501, ſanke: ertranke 692, kame 789, ſahe er 791, empfande: fande 855, 58, zohe 882, but zoch 902, gabe erſt 948, ſtieße 1145, bliebe 1213, auflaſe 1222, gefiele 1241, buche 1308, verſahe 1367; ſach is the usual form, 243, etc., but ſah euch 731; was 1035 and war 1105, 1160, both occur. Class I has been almost completely levelled out in favor of the plural vowel and this i has been lengthened in many cases to ie. Practically all weak preterites omit -e.

In Johann von Morzzheim's *Spiegel des Regiments* [1]) not one st. prt. ind. in -e occurs out of a total of 70. There is no levelling of radical vowels. In class I ei occurs always, e. g. ſchreib 50; war 33 and was: mas 53 both occur; ſah 125, 157, etc. and ſa 592 but never ſach. Practically all words irrespective of class omit -e.

In Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst* [2]) only 3 st. verbs have forms with -e in the prt. ind. 1st and 3rd sing.

zoch	4	zohe	4
ſach	2	ſahe, ſache	17
was (3)	81	fienge	1
war	8		
all others	414		
	509		22

Thus about 4% of all st. prts. ind. have -e. Up to No. 26 there are 149 weak prts. without -e and just one with -e, or less than 1% of all weak prts. retain -e. There is almost no levelling, except in class II, — zohen etc., but ſutten. In the sing. of the first class we find ei without exception, e. g. ſchrei, treib, ſchneid, etc.

The e-forms of the st. prt. ind. are much more numerous

---

[1]) Hrsg. v. K. Goedeke. BLV. 37. Bd. "Getruckt zů Oppenheim". At the end of the poem we find "Geendet seligklich 1515". All 957 lines were read.

[2]) Straßburg 1522. Selections in Kürschner DNL. 24. Ed. F. Bobertag. Statistics are based upon pp. 1—50.

in Jörg Wickram's *Rollwagenbüchlein*[1]). All the st. prts. in -e that occur in the selection in DNL. Vol. 24 are given.

ſchrey	4	ſchreie	1
fiel	4	fiele	2
was 30, war 45	75	ware	2
kam	29	kame	12
		blibe	2
treib	6	tribe	1
gab	21	gabe	1
hub	4	hube	1
ſchlug	2	ſchluge	1
fieng	9	fienge	3
trůg	4	trůge	1
gieng	9	gienge	3
erſchrack	1	erſchracke	1
zog, zoch	7	zohe	3
ſach	2	ſahe	9
fand	5	fande	2
ward	31	warde	12
aß	7	aſſe	2
ließ	17	ließe	1
all others	168		
	416 13 %		65

There is some levelling here but mainly in the first class. The old ei of the sing. is usual but occasionally forms like tribe, blibe, griff p. 188 occur. In the plural of class II, zugen, zogen and zuhen all are found. In the plural of the third class the u is always retained e. g. trunden, funden etc. There is very much apocope here. About as many weak prts. have the -e as st. prts. do. About half of the st. prt. subjs. omit final -e.

Valentin Schumann, Nachtbüchlein[2]).

was 2, war 25	27	ware	4
fůhr	1	fůre	1
kam	13	kame	6
nam	12	name	2
	53		13

[1]) DNL. 24. Bd. pp. 233—270. Wickram was "Stadtschreyber zů Burckhaim". The date of the first printing 1555, place unknown. The 1565 version was printed by Sigmund Feyerabend at Frankfurt a. Main.

[2]) Kürschner DNL. 24. Bd. Leipzig early in the 16th century. Prose. All the st. prts. in the whole section that is given where counted.

	53		13
trib 2, treib 1 . . .	3	tribe	2
		ſchlaffe	1
		ſchweige	1
gieng	11	gienge	2
		ſtacke	1
ſach, ſah	4	ſahe	8
ſprach	63	ſprache	1
ſtůnd	5	ſtůnde	5
fand	2	fande	4
ward	11	warde	2
all others	99	wande	1
	251 14%		41

The sing. of class I is about equally divided between the ei and i. The plural of class II usually has the vowel of the singular as zogen etc. The plural of class III is divided between the a and u, perhaps with the sing. vowel predominating, e. g. halffen, warden, but wurffen; ſprangen, trancken, beſunnen etc. In the same section 86 weak prts. without -e and 9 with -e occur a percentage of e-forms much less than that of the e-forms of the st. prt. Usually the weak preterite ends in -et as in Luther.

Michael Lindener, *Rastbüchlein und Katzipori*[1]).

was 1, war 30 . . .	31	ware	1
kam	5	kame	2
nam	8	name	1
gab	8	gabe	1
		ſchribe	1
		drunge	1
zog	2	zoge	1
gieng	8	gienge	2
fieng	2	fienge	1
		ſahe	7
		geſchahe	1
ward	3	wurde (p. 288) 1, warde 2	3
fand	2	funde	1
All others	51	bate	2
		ſchnitte	1
	120 18%		26

No example of ei was found in the sing. of class I. The e-form often has the plural vowel when the form without -e

[1]) Leipzig 1558. DNL. 24. Bd. All st. prts. that occur in the selection from this book given in Kürschner were counted p. 278ff.

retains the sing. vowel, e. g. drunge, wurde, funde. Most weak prts. drop final -e.

Hans Wilhelm Kirchhoff, *Wendunmuth* [1]).

was 6, war 30	36	ware (340)	1
gieng	26	gienge	1
trug	8	truge	1
ſach	2	ſahe	7
ſtach	1	ſtoche (345)	1
ſtund	8	ſtunde	3
		underwande	1
ward	22	warde	1
hielt	5	hielte (340)	1
trat	2	tratte	1
All others	158		
	268 6%		18

In the sing. of class I ei is the rule, only one example of i occurring in the whole selection. In the plural of class III a is never borrowed from the sing. e. g. funden, verſchwunden, etc. worden occurs, the o being taken from the p. part. Most weak prts. drop -e.

Jacob Frey, *Gartengesellschaft I* [2]).

kam	17	kame 232	1
nam	16	name 215	2
gab	15	gabe 214	1
		betroge 220	1
gieng	14	gienge 235	1
ſah, ſach	2	ſahe	4
zoh	1	zohe	13
ward	30	wurde (214) 1, warde (214) 4	5
fand	2	fande 220	1
ließ	11	ließe 219	2
trat	1	tratte 222	1
ſcheiß	2	ſchiſſe 224	1
		maſſe 226	1
aß	3	aſſe 234	1
All others	161		
	272 11%		35

war occurs 16 times, was 46. In the sing. of class I ei and i

[1]) Frankfurt 1563. DNL. 24. Bd. My figures are based upon pp. 308—350.

[2]) DNL. Vol. 24. The edition of 1575 is followed; the place of the printing is unknown. Frey was "Stattschreyber zu Maurszmünster" See Goedeke Grdr. § 159. The earlist edition bears the date 1556.

are about equally divided, e. g. ſteig, reit, ſcheiß etc. and blib, verwiß etc. There is no levelling in class III except in wurde and warde. Most weak prts. drop -e. St. prt. subjs. forms with -e and without -e are about even in number.

Martin Montanus, *Gartengesellschaft II* [1]).

kam	19	kame 244	3
		zoge, zohe 240 . . .	9
ſtig	2	ſtige 244	1
gieng	12	ginge 244	3
ward	9	warde 241	4
ſtund	2	ſtunde 242	2
fand	2	fande 248	1
		ſahe 242	7
batt	2	batte 245	1
reit	5	ritte 246	1
All others	97		
	150	17 %	32

was occurs 9 times, war 15. Only one verb in class I has the old ei in the prt. sing. ind., – reit. In all other cases we find i, as blib, trib etc. In class III a of the sing. is often taken into the plural e. g. warden 246, etc. Most words, including weak prts. omit final -e.

In the same author's *Wegkürtzer* [2]) we find a much higher percentage of e-forms. This difference is most probably due to the printers and not to the author. The date is about the same in each case, both written in prose. All the e-forms are given.

befahl	1	befahle 256	2
nam	5	name 261	1
		beſane 225	1
lieff	3	lieffe 257	2
		ſprange 257	1
		ſtiege 255	2
ſchlug	3	ſchluge 256	1
gieng	7	gienge 256	1
fieng	4	fienge 260	2
		ſahe 254	12
		geſchahe 255	1
zoch	1	zohe 260	2
	24		28

[1]) Straßburg 1557. DNL. 24. Bd.
[2]) Frankfurt 1565. DNL. 24. Bd. Schwänke 316—318.

	24		28
ſtunð	2	ſtunde 257	3
ſanð	1	ſande 256	1
warð	7	warde 256	2
thet, that	6	thete	2
tratt	2	trate 254	1
		bate 254	1
		laſe 255	1
hieß	1	hieße 255	1
All others	63		
	106 27%		40

war occurs 11 times, was 5. Here also the ei of the sing. of class I is practically supplanted by i. This i is very often lengthened and such forms as blieb, trieb, ſtiege, but ſchnitt, ſchwig etc. occur. Thus in the sing. of class I we find ei, i and ie. In class III verbs whose stems end in r+cons. almost always have a in the prt. plural e. g. warden 256, warffen etc., but those with n+cons. never, e. g. funden 256 etc.

Only one example of a st. prt. ind. in -e occurs in Paul Rebhun's *Susanna*[1], — *ware*: offenbare 1, 1, 20. Throughout the play there is an alternation of scenes containing either all masculine or all feminine rimes. In case of the example given the -e is added merely to produce a feminine rime. The reverse is very often the case. In the scenes with masc. rimes the final -e is often dropped in both words and that contrary to Rebhun's usual practice, e. g. (die) gab: (ich) hab, etc. Strong preterites occur frequently both in rime and verse but only one example with -e is found in the whole play.

[1]) Paul Rebhun's Dramen. BLV. 49. Bd. Susanna, 1535, Zwickau.